

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 9 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 4, 7, and 10-33 are canceled. Claim 6 is amended. Support for the amendment to claim 6 can be found in the original claims as filed. No new matter is added. The remaining claims were canceled in the previous response to office action. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants do not concede that the originally filed claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are included only to facilitate expeditious prosecution. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

### **I. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Asserted Anticipation**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by *Moughani*, Data Processing System Having a Trace Mechanism and Method Therefor, U.S. Patent 5,970,246, (October 19, 1999) (hereinafter, “*Moughani*”). Applicants have canceled these claims, thereby rendering the rejection moot.

The Examiner rejected claims 10-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by *IBM technical disclosure bulletin NN9612331*, “Processor Single Step Trace Facility Enhancements”, (published, December 1, 1996) (hereinafter, “*IBM*”). Applicants have canceled these claims, thereby rendering the rejection moot.

The Examiner rejected claims 16-27 and 34-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by *Levine et al.*, Hardware Mechanism for Instruction/Data Address Tracing, U.S. Patent 5,446,876 (August 29, 1995) (hereinafter, “*Levine*”). Applicants have canceled these claims, thereby rendering the rejection moot.

### **II. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Asserted Obviousness**

The Examiner rejected claims 28-33, and 40-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over *Levine*, in view of *Tanenbaum*, Structured Computer Organization, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. (published 1990) (hereinafter, “*Tanenbaum*”). Applicants have canceled these claims, thereby rendering the rejection moot.

### **III. Allowable Claims**

The examiner indicated that claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 9 are allowable. Applicants have canceled all other claims. Therefore, allowance of claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 9 is requested.

**IV. Conclusion**

The subject application is patentable over the cited references and should now be in condition for allowance. The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: 05/30/07

Respectfully submitted,

/Theodore D. Fay III/

Theodore D. Fay III  
Reg. No. 48,504  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777  
Attorney for Applicants